

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/314,958	IIDA, JUNICHI	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Joseph R. Pokrzywa	2622	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Joseph R. Pokrzywa.

(3) Naoyuki Tsuchiya.

(2) William Pieprz.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 13 May 2003.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference  
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant  
2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_ e) No.

Claim(s) discussed: j9

Identification of prior art discussed: Ohta (U.S. Pat. 6,356,849)

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.

Joseph R. Pokrzynski 5/13/03  
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Discussed how prior art differs from claimed invention. Notably discussed that communication result is not specifically for e-mail transmission, but rather only for communication, as seen in Figs. 10 + 11. Initially, examiner agrees with applicant with respect to this limitation. ~~The~~ and will reconsider ~~the~~ claim language which would ~~not~~ distinguish this feature.